

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18-20, and 22-31 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 22, 25 and 29 are amended.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18-20, and 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kariya, Hancock, and Lui. Applicant respectfully submits that Kariya, Hancock and Lui, alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1, 12, 22, 25 and 29, and hence, do not render any of the pending claims unpatentable.

At page 6 of the Final Office Action the Examiner states that the claim “term ‘with’ can be reasonably interpreted to refer to any single display interface in which joint presentation of the two types of ‘menu information’ takes place, and it does not require that the ‘display’ occur in a single image output.” Based on this interpretation of the term “with” the Examiner asserts that a sequence of images disclosed by Lui in Figs. 4-6, in combination with Kariya and Hancock, renders the claim unpatentable.

Each of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 12, 22, 25 and 29) is amended to recite “when the menu information is updated, the menu controlling device controls the menu display to display updated menu information and the predetermined fixed menu information in a single image output.” See, for example, Fig. 4. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kariya, Hancock and Lui, even if combined as asserted in the final Office Action, does not include all the limitations of the claims since the combination would not display updated menu information and predetermined fixed menu information in a single image output. Accordingly, it

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Application No. 09/822,496


Attorney Docket No. Q63783

is respectfully submitted that the asserted combination does not render any of the claims pending in the application unpatentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
J. Warren Lytle, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 6, 2006